



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/643,521	08/19/2003	Rolf W. Reisgies	034664-0141	4464
23524	7590	11/16/2005	EXAMINER	
FOLEY & LARDNER LLP			SMITH, KIMBERLY S	
150 EAST GILMAN STREET			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 1497			3644	
MADISON, WI 53701-1497			DATE MAILED: 11/16/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/643,521	REISGIES, ROLF W.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kimberly S. Smith	3644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 August 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 11-18 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. The affidavit filed on 08/29/05 under 37 CFR 1.131 is sufficient to overcome the White reference.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 11-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferris, US Patent 3,019,763 in view of Smith, US Patent 4,250,836.

Ferris discloses a modular milking parlor comprising a frame base, plurality of upright members, at least one longitudinal support member attached to the upright support members, wheels and a plurality of milking stations (as seen in the figures) including a means for raising and lowering the platform to the ground for lessening the climb of the cows to the unit. Ferris further discloses a plurality of wheeled carriages having a carriage body (i.e. the axle mechanism), which is detachable from the milking parlor frame (as it is well known in the art that axle mechanisms are detachable from frames in order to replace them when damage occurs thereto). While Ferris does not disclose four or more wheeled carriages, it would have been an

obvious matter of design choice to use four or more carriages, since the Applicant has not disclosed that four or more carriages solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with any number of carriages so long as the frame is supported appropriately, which is within the knowledge of one in the art to discern the appropriate number). Further, Ferris does not teach the wheels being adjustably mounted so as to raise and lower with respect to the carriage body. Smith teaches within the analogous art of animal related trailers means for adjustably mounting the wheels (via hydraulic operation, column 4, lines 63-66) to raise and lower them with regards to the platform to reduce the climb for the animal to enter the trailer. Because these two structures for lowering and raising a platform to reduce the vertical distance required by the animal to enter the device were art-recognized equivalents at the time the invention was made, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to substitute the hydraulic system taught by Smith for the jacking system disclosed by Ferris to reduce the amount of physical labor required by the operator.

Regarding claim 13, Ferris as modified discloses the invention as claimed with the exception of the use of steel T-beams. It would have been an obvious matter of design choice to design the frame base with T-beams since the applicant has not disclosed that the T-beams solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with the use of an I-beam or an L-beam. Further, Ferris as modified does not positively disclose the structure is made from steel. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use steel, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ

Regarding claim 14, Ferris as modified discloses the use of holes in the frame base (60) with the exception of positively disclosing their positioning within the frame. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to place the holes in upright webs of the T-beams of the base, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. As such, the frame may be connected to the wheeled carriage by the holes if so desired as it has been held that the recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations.

Regarding claim 15, Ferris as modified discloses the frame base including a front longitudinal member and a back longitudinal member that are parallel to each other and wherein a plurality of lateral members extend between and are attached to the front and back longitudinal members.

Regarding claim 17, Ferris as modified discloses groups of milk hoses, vacuum lines and control lines extending from each of the milking stations together to a longitudinal end of the milking parlor

5. Claims 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferris as modified as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of van der Lely, US Patent 6,044,793.

Ferris as modified discloses the invention substantially as claimed including the structure containing all of the equipment needed for milking an animal. However, Ferris as modified does not disclose the milking station containing an automatic teat cup cluster detacher including a support arm for supporting a teat cup cluster. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use an automatic teat cup cluster detacher with a support arm in conjunction

with the milking parlor of Ferris as modified as it was known in the art at the time the invention was made to use an automated teat cup cluster as seen in van der Lely in conjunction with a milking parlor in order to milk a plurality of cows at one time.

Conclusion

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Willson et al. (US 4,630,570), Tyquin (US 4,366,775), Mollhagen (Re. 33,959).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kimberly S. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-6909. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 10:00-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on 571-272-7045. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kimberly S Smith
Examiner
Art Unit 3644

**TERI PHAM LUU
SUPERVISORY
PRIMARY EXAMINER**

kss